

AO 133 (Rev. 12/09) Bill of Costs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the
Western District of Washington

ESSOCIATE, INC.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	Case No.: Case No. 11-cv-727-bbc
EPIC MEDIA GROUP, INC., ET AL.,)	
Defendants.)	

BILL OF COSTS

Judgment having been entered in the above entitled action on 05/20/2013 against Essociate, Inc.,
Date
the Clerk is requested to tax the following as costs:

Fees of the Clerk	\$	
Fees for service of summons and subpocna		
Fees for printed or electronically recorded transcripts necessarily obtained for use in the case		12,370.35 ^①
Fees and disbursements for printing		
Fees for witnesses (itemize on page two)		0.00
Fees for exemplification and the costs of making copies of any materials where the copies are necessarily obtained for use in the case.		3,390.63 ^②
Docket fees under 28 U.S.C. 1923		
Costs as shown on Mandate of Court of Appeals		
Compensation of court-appointed experts		
Compensation of interpreters and costs of special interpretation services under 28 U.S.C. 1828		
Other costs (please itemize)		
	TOTAL	\$ 15,760.98

SPECIAL NOTE: Attach to your bill an itemization and documentation for requested costs in all categories.

Declaration

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing costs are correct and were necessarily incurred in this action and that the services for which fees have been charged were actually and necessarily performed. A copy of this bill has been served on all parties in the following manner:

☒ Electronic service ☐ First class mail, postage prepaid

☐ Other: By ECF and Email

s/ Attorney: s/James D. Peterson

Name of Attorney: James D. Peterson

For: Epic Media Group, Inc., et al. Date: 08/23/2013
Name of Claiming Party

Taxation of Costs

Costs are taxed in the amount of \$ 15,760.98 and included in the judgment.

Peter Oppenheimer
Clerk of Court

By: _____
Deputy Clerk

10/28/13
Date

Essociate, Inc. v. Azoogole.com, Inc. et. al.
11-cv-727-bbc

NOTES TO CLERK'S TAXATION OF COSTS

1. Plaintiff objects to the charges for unused depositions, court reporter delivery fees, and both videotaping and transcribing the depositions. Each of these objections fails. The test for whether the cost of a deposition is taxable is whether the deposition was "necessarily obtained for use in the case." 28 U.S.C. § 1920. There is no indication that these depositions were not obtained for use in the case, so these costs are allowed. The court reporter's delivery fees are required in order to obtain the transcript, so these costs are also taxable. Finally, 28 U.S.C. § 1920 authorizes costs for both videotaping and transcribing depositions. *Little v. Mitsubishi Motors North America, Inc.* 514 F.3d 699 (7th Cir. 2008). All of these costs are allowed.
2. Plaintiff objects to the request for photocopy costs as improperly documented. Defendants are not required to submit an extremely detailed request for photocopy costs. They need only "provide the best breakdown obtainable from retained records." *Northbrook Excess & Surplus v. Procter & Gamble*. 924 F.2d 633 (7th Cir. 1991). The records defendants provided are sufficient, and these costs are allowed.